

REMARKS

The Office Action of 10/31/2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 were rejected as being anticipated by each of Keckler and Hurd. The claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited references. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The present invention differs from Keckler, among other respects, in that a previously-fetched header is used to determine which segments of an instruction word are not fetched. In Keckler, tag bits stored with the segments themselves determine a skip length for the respective segments. This arrangement is disadvantageous.

The present invention differs from Hurd, among other respects, in that the segments of a current instruction word that are fetched are determined *without regard to* a next instruction word. In Hurd, segments are not fetched when all of the successive segments in successive instructions word (including for example a current instruction word and a next instruction word) contain no-ops.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-12 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Ure', is written over a horizontal line.

Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 12/05/2007